



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/870,319

05/30/2001

Debasish Banerjee

ROC920010082US1

7641

46797

7590

10/31/2008

IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW  
DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1  
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH  
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER

BAYARD, DJENANE M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2441

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/31/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/870,319	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BANERJEE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> DJENANE M. BAYARD	<b>Art Unit</b> 2441	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-20,33-42,45-47,50 and 51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-20, 33-42, 45-47 and 50-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This is in response to communication filed on 10/03/08 in which claims 10-20, 33-42, 45-47 and 50-51 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10, 33 and 45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 10 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claim 10 recite the limitation "receiving, at a server, a first request from a client, wherein the first request is a request to invoke a remote procedure call at the server; receiving, at the server, a second request from the client ,wherein the second request comprise an internationalization context for processing the first request". The specification fails to describe the invention in such terms that one skilled in the art can make and use the claimed invention. The information contained in the disclosure of the

Art Unit: 2441

application is not sufficient to inform those skilled in the relevant art the nature and the cause of the second request.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 10-14, 17, 33-37, 40, 45, 47, 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0162093 to Zhou et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,430,607 to Kavner and further in view of U.S. patent Application No. 5,404,523 to DellaFera et al.

a. As per claims 10 and 33, Zhou et al teaches a computer-implemented method

Art Unit: 2441

operative in a distributed computing environment having clients and a plurality of servers located across geographically dispersed boundaries (See page 2, paragraph [0017], [0025], and [0062]) Zhou teaches a request from the client wherein the request comprises an internationalization context, wherein the internationalization context specifies geographically specific parameters set for the client (See page 6, paragraph [0074]); extracting the internationalization context from the second request (See page 6, paragraph [0074], *the compiler extracts the locale-specific elements*); processing the first request at the server using the internationalization context (See page 6, paragraph [0074, 0077], *replaces the extracted elements in the web page with function calls to the resource bundle*) wherein processing the first request comprises: providing the first request and internationalization context to an application configured to perform calculations requested by the remote procedure call using the geographically specific parameters included in the internationalization context and further configured to return a result formatted according to a formatting convention selected based on the geographically specific parameters (See page 1, paragraph [0008], page 3, paragraph [0032-0033], *the framework interacts with the presentation layer to prepare replies for return to the clients in a format and protocol suitable for presentation on the client*) ; attaching the internationalization context to the first request (See page 6, paragraph [0066-0074]; Furthermore, Zhou et al teaches wherein the resources may reside with the server system or located remotely. However, Zhou et fails to teach receiving, at a server, a first request from a client, wherein the first request is a request to invoke a remote procedure call at a server; receiving, at the server, a second request from the client, wherein the second request and to explicitly teach propagating the first request with the attached

Art Unit: 2441

internationalization context from the server to an application associated with an application interface on a second server.

Kavner teaches if the remote request requires additional static parameters, the client application returns to state 1310 and again calls the AddParam routine (See col. 3, lines 42-55, col. 24, lines 56-59, col. 33, lines 27-57, *receiving, at a server a second request comprising additional parameters*).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kavner in the claimed invention of Zhou in order to allow the use of incremental data blocks (See col. 3, lines 42-54).

DellaFera et al teaches control automatically passes to block 104 where the un-marshalled request-context is stored and passed along. More specifically, the request-context is stored in the server's thread context and a copy is passed to the server's local request manager. Control automatically passes to decision block 105 where it is determined if the server has fully serviced its current request (the request sent from its client) or if the server requires assistance from another server. If the server requires assistance then control passes to block 106 where an RPC is issued and the request-context is pulled from the server's context thread and marshalled into the outgoing call. In one embodiment, a marshalling routine is called when the RPC is issued; the marshalling routine pulls the request-context from the server's context thread and marshals it into the RPC (See col. 4, lines 60-67, col. 5, lines 6-36, 57-67 and col. 6, lines 1-24).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of DellaFera in the claimed invention of Zhou et al in order to uniquely identify, track and manage end-user requests as they propagate throughout the transaction processing system and to allow a server in the path of execution of the end-user request to access the standard input and output operation on the standard input and output of the end-user client (See col. 2, lines 64-67 and col. 3, lines 1-2).

b. As per claims 11 and 34, Zhou et al in view of DellaFera teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Zhou et al teaches wherein processing the first request comprises providing the first request and internationalization context to an application to perform calculations using the internationalization context and return a result formatted according to the internationalization context (See page 6, paragraph [0074-0077]).

c. As per claims 12 and 35, Zhou et al in view of DellaFera teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Zhou et al fails to explicitly teach sending the internationalization context from the server to at least one of the plurality of servers in the distributed computing environment.

DellaFera et al teaches sending the context from the server to at least one of the plurality of servers in the distributed computing environment (See col. 4, lines 60-67, col. 5, lines 6-36, 57-67 and col. 6, lines 1-24).

Art Unit: 2441

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of DellaFera in the claimed invention of Zhou et al in order to uniquely identify, track and manage end-user requests as they propagate throughout the transaction processing system and to allow a server in the path of execution of the end-user request to access the standard input and output operation on the standard input and output of the end-user client (See col. 2, lines 64-67 and col. 3, lines 1-2).

d. As per claims 13 and 36, Zhou et al in view of DellaFera teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Zhou et al teaches wherein the internationalization context contains a country identifier (See page 6, paragraph [0077], *en\_US*).

e. As per claims 14 and 37, Zhou et al in view of DellaFera teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Zhou et al teaches wherein the internationalization context contains a language identifier (See page 6, paragraph [0077])

f. As per claims 17 and 40, Zhou et al in view of DellaFera teaches the claimed invention as described above. Zhou et al teaches wherein the locale specification teaches a country identifier and a language identifier (See page 6, paragraph [0077]).



Art Unit: 2441

7. Claims 45, 47, 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0162093 to Zhou et al in view of U.S. patent Application No. 5,404,523 to DellaFera et al.

a. As per claim 45, Zhou et al teaches receiving, at a first computer, a first request from a second computer, the first request including an internationalization context, wherein the internationalization context specifies geographically specific parameters set for the client computer (See page 3, paragraph [0033]; extracting the internationalization context from the first request (See page, 6, paragraph [0074]); Furthermore, Zhou et al teaches wherein the application of the second server is configured to perform calculations requested by the second remote procedure call using the geographically specific parameters included in the internationalization context and is further configured to return formatted according to a formatting convention selected based on the geographically specific parameters (See page 1, paragraph [0008], page 3, paragraph [0032-0033], *the framework interacts with the presentation layer to prepare replies for return to the clients in a format and protocol suitable for presentation on the client*). However, Zhou et al teaches fails to explicitly teach associating the internationalization context with a thread executing a second request, from the second computer, to invoke a remote procedure call at the first computer; generating a main body of a second request to invoke a second remote procedure call attaching the internationalization context to the second request; and propagating the second request with the attached internationalization context from the server to an application associated with an application interface on a second server,

Art Unit: 2441

DellaFera et al teaches control automatically passes to block 104 where the un-marshalled request-context is stored and passed along. More specifically, the request-context is stored in the server's thread context and a copy is passed to the server's local request manager. Control automatically passes to decision block 105 where it is determined if the server has fully serviced its current request (the request sent from its client) or if the server requires assistance from another server. If the server requires assistance then control passes to block 106 where an RPC is issued and the request-context is pulled from the server's context thread and marshalled into the outgoing call. In one embodiment, a marshalling routine is called when the RPC is issued; the marshalling routine pulls the request-context from the server's context thread and marshals it into the RPC (See col. 4, lines 60-67, col. 5, lines 6-36, 57-67 and col. 6, lines 1-24).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of DellaFera in the claimed invention of Zhou et al in order to uniquely identify, track and manage end-user requests as they propagate throughout the transaction processing system and to allow a server in the path of execution of the end-user request to access the standard input and output operation on the standard input and output of the end-user client (See col. 2, lines 64-67 and col. 3, lines 1-2).

b. As per claim 47, Zhou et al in view of DellaFera et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Zhou et al fails to teach sending a first main body of the first request to the thread.

Art Unit: 2441

DellaFera et al teaches sending a first main body of the first request to the thread (See col. 6, lines 3-13).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of DellaFera in the claimed invention of Zhou et al in order to uniquely identify, track and manage end-user requests as they propagate throughout the transaction processing system and to allow a server in the path of execution of the end-user request to access the standard input and output operation on the standard input and output of the end-user client (See col. 2, lines 64-67 and col. 3, lines 1-2).

c. As per claim 50, Zhou et al in view of DellaFera teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Zhou et al fails to teach wherein the thread comprises a legacy application thread.

DellaFera et teaches wherein the thread comprises a legacy application thread (See col. 6, lines 5-29).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of DellaFera in the claimed invention of Zhou et al in order to uniquely identify, track and manage end-user requests as they propagate throughout the transaction processing system and to allow a server in the path of execution of the end-user request to access the standard input and output operation on the standard input and output of the end-user client (See col. 2, lines 64-67 and col. 3, lines 1-2).

Art Unit: 2441

d. As per claim 51, Zhou et al in view of DellaFera teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Zhou et al teaches wherein the internationalization component comprises culture sensitive information (See page 5, paragraph [0062]).

8. Claims 15-16, 18-20, 38-39, 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0162093 to Zhou et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,430,607 to Kavner and further in view of U.S. patent Application No. 5,404,523 to DellaFera et al as applied to claims 10 and 33 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0184308 to Levy et al.

a. As per claims 15 and 38, Zhou et al in view of DellaFera teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Zhou et al in view of DellaFera fails to explicitly teach wherein the internationalization context contains a time zone identifier.

Levy et al teaches wherein the internationalization context contains a time zone identifier (See page 4, paragraph [0042]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Levy et al in the claimed invention of Zhou et al in view of DellaFera in order to influence all date-time related operations (See page 4, paragraph [0042]).

Art Unit: 2441

b. As per claims 16 and 39, Zhou et al in view of DellaFera teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Zhou et al in view of DellaFera fails to explicitly teach wherein the internationalization context contains at least a locale specification and a time zone identifier.

Levy et al teaches wherein the internationalization context contains at least a locale specification and a time zone identifier (See page 4, paragraph [0042]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Levy et al in the claimed invention of Zhou et al in view of DellaFera in order to govern user interface, data presentation and influence all date-time related operations (See page 4, paragraph [0042]).

c. As per claims 18 and 41, Zhou et al in view of DellaFera teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Zhou et al teaches wherein processing the first request according to a country identifier of the server if the internationalization context does not contain a country identifier.

Levy et al teaches processing the request according to a country identifier of the server if the internationalization context does not contains a country identifier (See page 9, paragraph [0099]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Zhou et al in view of DellaFera in the claimed invention of Levy et al in order to provide a mechanism that is dynamically

Art Unit: 2441

sensitive to the locale and which accesses locale-specific information (See page 2, paragraph [0011]).

d. As per claims 19, Zhou et al in view of DellaFera teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Zhou et al in view of DellaFera fails to teach wherein processing the first request according to a universal time zone identifier if the internationalization context does not contain a time zone identifier of the client.

Levy et al teaches processing the first request according to a universal time zone identifier if the internationalization context does not contain a time zone identifier of the client (See page 4, paragraph [0047, page 6, paragraph [0064] and page 9, paragraph [0099]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Levy et al in the claimed invention of Zhou et al in view of DellaFera in order to provide a mechanism that is dynamically sensitive to the locale and which accesses locale-specific information (See page 2, paragraph [0011]).

e. As per claims 20 and 42, Zhou et al in view of DellaFera teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Zhou et al in view of DellaFera fails to teach processing the first request according to a time zone identifier of the server if the internationalization context does not contain a time zone identifier.

Art Unit: 2441

Levy et al teaches processing the first request according to a time zone identifier of the server if the internationalization context does not contain a time zone identifier (See page 4, paragraph [0047], page 6, paragraph [0064] and page 9, paragraph [0099]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Levy et al in the claimed invention of Zhou et al in view of DellaFera in order to provide a mechanism that is dynamically sensitive to the locale and which accesses locale-specific information (See page 2, paragraph [0011]).

9. Claims 15-16, 18-20, 38-39, 41-42 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0162093 to Zhou et al in view of U.S. patent Application No. 5,404,523 to DellaFera et al as applied to claims 45 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0184308 to Levy et al.

a. As per claim 46, Zhou et al in view of DellaFera teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Zhou et al in view of DellaFera fails to explicitly teach wherein the internationalization context contains at least a locale specification and a time zone identifier.

Levy et al teaches wherein the internationalization context contains at least a locale specification and a time zone identifier (See page 4, paragraph [0042]).

Art Unit: 2441

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Levy et al in the claimed invention of Zhou et al in view of DellaFera in order to govern user interface, data presentation and influence all date-time related operations (See page 4, paragraph [0042]).

### ***Conclusion***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Djenane M. Bayard whose telephone number is (571) 272-3878. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday 5:30 AM- 3:00 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Art Unit: 2441

Djenane Bayard

/D. M. B./

Examiner, Art Unit 2441

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444